UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,284	06/20/2003	Steve Burns	50277-2139	9791

42425 7590 08/10/2010

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER/ORACLE
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110-1083

EXAMINER	
TSUI, WILSON W	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/10/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	**Application No.** 10/600,284	**Applicant(s)** BURNS ET AL.	
	Examiner WILSON TSUI	**Art Unit** 2178	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 26 July 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
   a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
   b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
   (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
   (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
   Claim(s) allowed: _____.
   Claim(s) objected to: _____.
   Claim(s) rejected: *1-23,47 and 49-72*.
   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: *24-46 and 48*.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/CESAR B PAULA/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant first argues that, "Fig 5 and this passage from Schaeck suggests that the remote portlet access information includes includes the description of the remote portlet but does not include any information that is specific to any particular page [and] this is because Schaeck makes it very clear that a remote portlet is registered locally only once, but can be invoked for many different pages by creating remote proxy processes that are configured with the remote access information for the registered remote portlet".

However, this argument is not persuasive since, Schaeck's invention uses portlet description/service-descriptions to implement portlet access information (column 4, lines 3-20), in order to dynamically integrate remote portlets into a portal page by providing local portlets as remote portlet web-services. As known in the art, and explained/taught by Schaeck, the service-descriptions include IDL parameter descriptions in order to properly translate portlet parameters compatible for a particular portlet (column 2, lines 42-49, and lines 53-59). Schaeck gives example of a particular page (such as HR portlet page), which can communicate with a remote portlet (HR Web-Service), and the Service Requester (portal server assembling the HR portlet page) uses the IDL for converting the input data (passed using parameters storing position and last grade) format generated by the employee portal manager into a data format required by Web-Service (HR-Web-Service) and sends a SOAP-request containing the converted input data to the HR Web-Service (column 1, lines 58-67, column 2, lines 42-49 and lines 53-59). As shown in Fig 7K, a page is shown, which dynamically includes a plurality of remote portlets (the page can be dynamically configured to map to one or more portlets (Fig. 7I).

The applicant secondly argues that the passage (col. 1, lines 58-64) "makes it very clear that any data entered by a user is actually associated with portlet parameters, and that the user enters the data into the portlet through a query form provided by the portlet.

However, the examiner respectfully points out that the cited passage was used to merely cite that it is known in the art to enter data at a local page, such that the data can be used to pass local data to another remote service via SOAP communication (col. 1, lines 58-64). Schaeck improves upon the prior art by allowing communication from a local page to a remote portlet (the remote portlet providing the "service") via SOAP. Even in Fig 7K of Schaeck's invention, the resulting page shows selected remote portlets dynamically included (not hardcoded) in the page via SOAP, using portlet access information (column 4, lines 3-20) and user selections of portlets from options screen such as Fig. 7I. As explained above, a separate mapping is retrieved/inspected using the portlet access information and 'service-descriptions' data, include parameter data (to establish proper input/output data passing/exchange) for proper SOAP communication between requesting and providing service. Thus, since Schaeck is able to establish proper SOAP communication by recognizing a page (Fig 7K) is to dynamically include selected remote portlets via retrieved/inspected mapping data, then Schaeck has the ability to pass/exchanged at a from a local page to a remote portlet, and thus properly reads upon the argued parameter requirements of the claim.

The applicant argues "Since customly-generated HTML code has nothing to do with page parameters, and since ABRAMS does not even describe portlets or any functionality of using portlets, it is respectively submitted that ABRAMS in general and the above passage from ABRAMS in particular do not describe or suggest the feature of claim 1 of generating a mapping that maps one or more page parameters to one or more portlet parameters, where the mapping is stored separate from pages associated with the one or more page parameters".

However, the applicant's argument is not persuasive, since the generated code is based upon values being passed (from a page) for use for the generated code to generate an appropriate window(s) of information (Abrams, col. 6, lines 12-25). Furthermore, the applicant argues that the limitation of "generating a mapping that maps one or more page parameters to one or more portlet parameters, where the mapping is stored separate from pages associated with the one or more page parameters" is not taught by ABRAMS; however, the examiner respectfully points out that it is the combination of ABRAMS and Schaeck that teach the entire argued limitation.

The applicant argues ABRAMS and Schaeck do not describe or suggest the feature of claim 1 of determining that the web page is associated with a page parameter from the one or more page parameters.

However, the examiner respectfully directs the applicant's attention to the paragraphs above, for how the combination of ABRAMS and Schaeck teach the argued limitation.

The applicant argues that "ABRAMS and Schaeck do not describe or suggest the feature of claim1 of wherein using the mapping includes retrieving and inspecting the mapping to determine that the page parameter is mapped to a portlet parameter of a portlet".

However, the examiner respectfully directs the applicant's attention to the paragraphs above, for how the combination of ABRAMS and Schaeck teach the argued limitation.

The applicant argues in page 9 that it is not clear as to how ABRAMS and Schaeck can be combined because receiving user input as a program parameter of a standalone application has nothing to do with using remote portlet access information to invoke remote portlets when pages that reference the remote portlets are displayed.

However, the examiner respectfully points out that Abrams teaches that input data can be passed to a program/service/algorithm to generate HTML code (Abrams, col. 6, lines 12-25). Schaeck improves upon the prior art for using local portlets/(such the application of ABRAMS which shows windows of types of information based upon input data), such that the application can flexibly include more windows/portlets without having to install the portlet code locally (Schaeck, column 3, lines 33-37). As explained, above, the communications are established to integrate the portlets into a page, using a retrieved mapping to properly communicate with a remote service, such as at least one selected/enabled portlet. Thus, as explained for the combination of Schaeck and Abrams in the

previous office action (and also in the paragraphs immediately above), the passing of data from input to a program/service/algorithm is modified such that mapping information can be used to establish a more efficient way to integrate remote portlets for a particular page.

The applicant argues that ABRAMS and Schaeck do not describe or suggest the feature of claim 1 of passing a value associated with the page parameter to the portlet as a value of the portlet parameter.

However, as explained in the paragraphs above, Schaeck teaches that the parameters of communication are indeed established to properly select and communicate with a remote portlet. Thus, the applicant's argument is not persuasive.

With regards to claim 18,
The examiner respectfully points out that the applicant also argues that the cited "parameters" have to be variables for storing data. However, the claim language does not specify the type of parameters, and thus, the examiner respectfully explains that the term parameters, can also be interpreted as "guidelines" or limits/boundaries.

The applicant argues that Abrams or Schaeck does not teach 'events', however, the examiner points out that Abrams teaches that for an "action" (user input), there is a resulting "reaction" (Abrams, column 4, lines 20-21: whereas a web address/selection is initiated and processed (reaction)) for local web pages/portlet-algorithms (the portlets taking the action, and producing a reaction). Schaeck further improves upon Abrams, as similarly explained above, such that data from a local web page can be communicated to a remote service (the remote service being a remote portlet). Thus, combination of Abrams and Schaeck thus, produce an enhanced ability to not only pass data from a local source, but, also pass data to a remote service, the remote service being a portlet that produces a reaction to an input data/event, as similarly explained above. Thus, the applicant's argument is not persuasive.

Additionally, the applicant argues that there is no event based functionality when invoking a remote portlet.

However, as similarly explained above, data can be initiated/sent to remote services, as known in the art, and since as also known in the art, and taught by Abrams, portlet/algorithms react to input to produce output, and since Schaeck further extends portlet functionality, by allowing data to be passed to them remotely through mapping data, Schaeck effectively extends the passing of input/event data when invoking communications with remote portlet(s).

With respect to independent claims 49 and independent claims 66 for being allowable since independent claims 1 and 18 are respectively allowable; is not persuasive since claims 1 and 18 have been explained/shown to be rejected.

With respect to arguments for the claims directly or indirectly dependent upon the argued independent claims; they are not persuasive since the independent claims have been shown/explained to be rejected, as similarly explained above.
.